

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-3 are rejected. New claims 4-10 are added. Claims 1-3 are amended herein to place them in better form. The specification has been amended to place it in better form and to correct a typographical error.

The Abstract has been objected to. Appropriate correction has been made.

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,010,200 (Hays).

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *See Verdegaal Brothers Inc. v. Union Oil Company of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Claim 1 recites ribs vertically sandwiching the flange and Hays fails to disclose this limitation.

The Office Action states that Hays discloses ribs 30 which vertically sandwich the flange. However, item 30 in Hays is an adapter rail. Hays discloses in column 2, lines 52-58 that “[t]he runners 26 are generally S-shaped in cross-section and have an L-shaped inside surface 32 constructed to receive an adapter rail 30.” Thus, the L-shaped portion of the runners 26 is to receive the adapter rail 30, in contrast to the adapter rail 30 vertically sandwiching the runners 26. This can be clearly seen in Fig. 3, where the adapter rail 30 is on the S-shaped portion of the runners 26. Thus, the adapter rail is not sandwiching the flange and

therefore the limitation of the ribs sandwiching the flange has not been shown in Hays.

Claim 2 recites a rib supporting a lower surface of the flange. In Hays, the runner 26 is supporting the adapter rail 30. Accordingly, the Office Action has not shown any rib supporting a lower surface of the flange.

Claim 3 recites a screw-in part at the drawer, where the screw-in part is connected to the flange so that the flange is sandwiched between the ribs. The Office Action has not identified any screw-in part at the drawer where the screw-in part is connected to the flange so that the flange is sandwiched between the ribs.

Claim 4 is patentable for similar reasons as claim 1 since it recites a first rib abutting a first surface of the flange and a second rib abutting a second surface of the flange. As is clear in Fig. 3 of Hays, such limitation is not disclosed in Hays. Claims 5-10 are patentable at least for the reason that they depend from a patentable base claim. *See In re Royka and Martin*, 180 USPQ 580, 583 (CCPA 1974).

Claims 1-3 were amended to be in better form. New claims 4-10 have been added, support being found in, for example, the claims as filed and in Figure 3, Figure 5, and page 8 of the specification as filed.

Applicant respectfully requests a one month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. **The fee of \$120.00 for the extension is provided**

for in the charge authorization presented in the PTO Form 2038, Credit Card Payment form, provided herewith.

If there is any discrepancy between the fee(s) due and the fee payment authorized in the Credit Card Payment Form PTO-2038 or the Form PTO-2038 is missing or fee payment via the Form PTO-2038 cannot be processed, the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg
C. Bruce Hamburg
Reg. No. 22,389
Attorney for Applicants

By and,

By Ricardo Unikel
Ricardo Unikel
Reg. No. 52,309
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340

enc: Form PTO-2038